

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed as a supplement to the previous Amendment filed on January 27, 2009. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his helpfulness and consideration during telephone interviews with the undersigned Attorney. The substance of the amendments herein are respectfully believed to reflect those discussion.

The present amendments are clarifications intended to more precisely set forth the present invention. Support for the present amendments are found throughout the Specification as originally filed. For example, support is found on page 28 of the Specification in lines 8-16.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 12, 15-20, 23, 25, 26, 29-34, 37, 39, 40 and 43-46 were rejected based on the combination of United States Patent 5,687,167A of Bertin et al. ("Bertin et al.") with United States Patent 6,771,661B1 of Chawla et al. ("Chawla et al.").

Nothing in the combination of Bertin et al. and Chawla et al. disclose or suggest any system or method for allocating resources on a network, including:

. . . installing at the future activation time of said at least one internet protocol traffic filter in the policy enforcement point includes determining that two nodes have requested the same service reservation, and modifying, responsive to the determining that two nodes have requested the same service reservation, the matching criteria of a previously installed internet protocol traffic filter by replacing an internet protocol network address of the previously installed internet protocol traffic filter with a range of internet protocol network addresses to increase the number of users with access to the network without increasing the number of filters installed in the network devices.

as in the present independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 43. Neither Bertin et al. nor Chawla et al. teach or suggest even the desirability of installing an internet protocol traffic filter at a future activation time by aggregating multiple requests into a single filter upon detecting that a request

for a service that matches a service in a previously installed filter by replacing an internet protocol network address of the previously installed internet protocol traffic filter with a range of internet protocol network addresses to increase the number of users with access to the network without increasing the number of filters installed in the network devices, as in the present independent claims. Accordingly, the combination of Bertin et al. and Chawla et al. does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with respect to the present independent claims 1, 15, 29 and 43, and dependent claims 2-6, 9, 11, 12, 16-20, 23, 25, 26, 30-34, 37, 39, 40 and 44-46 are believed to be patentable over the combination of Bertin et al. and Chawla et al. for at least the same reasons.

Other dependent claims stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 over combinations of Bertin et al., Chawla et al. with United States Patent 6,459,682B1 of Ellesson et al. ("Ellesson et al."), and with United States Patent number 6,785,728 of Schneider et al. ("Schneider et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed in detail above, the combination of Bertin et al. and Chawla et al. fails to disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims. Adding the teachings of Ellesson et al. and/or Schneider et al. to Bertin et al. and Chawla et al. does not remedy the shortcomings of Bertin et al. and Chawla et al. in this regard. Ellesson et al. teaches a system for controlling packet traffic in a network of originating, receiving and intermediate nodes. Schneider et al. teach that users can be identified in a display window (window 909) by IP addresses for purposes of populating an access control list through a graphical user interface. In column 29, lines 11 through 64, Schneider et al. disclose that a range of IP addresses (1317) can be used to identify users for a single access filter. The access filter of Schneider et al. is described as being used in response to receipt of an access request, at the time the request is

received, to identify user groups used for determining whether a requesting user has access to a requested information resource. Applicants respectfully urge that combinations of Bertin et al., Chawla et al. with Ellesson et al. and/or Schneider et al. also do not disclose or suggest any system or method that includes installing an internet protocol traffic filter at a future activation time by aggregating multiple requests into a single filter upon detecting that a request for a service that matches a service in a previously installed filter by replacing an internet protocol network address of the previously installed internet protocol traffic filter with a range of internet protocol network addresses to increase the number of users with access to the network without increasing the number of filters installed in the network devices, as in the present independent claims. The combination of Bertin et al., Chawla et al. with Ellesson et al. and/or Schneider et al. therefore does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness either under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the independent claims, and the dependent claims are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that all rejections of the Examiner should be withdrawn. This application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone David A. Dagg, Applicants' Attorney at 617.630.1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 16, 2009
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 120-296